

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/728,343	12/01/2000	Gary Mark Crosbie	200-0188	4125
28395	7590 08/03/2004		EXAMINER	
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL			SAMPLE, DAVID R	
1000 TOWN ( 22ND FLOOI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238			1755	
			DATE MAILED: 08/03/200/	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/728,343	CROSBIE, GARY MARK			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David Sample	1755			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 M	ay 2004.				
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-20 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-18 is/are withdraw</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 3,4 and 6 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,5,13,14,19 and 20 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	n from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	` '			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1755

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Any rejections and/or objections, made in the previous Office Action, and not repeated below, are hereby withdrawn.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### Election/Restrictions

The request for the withdrawal of the restriction is noted, however, the request is not timely because any traversal of the rejection should have been made in response to the restriction requirement. See MPEP 818.03(a).

Notwithstanding the lack of timeliness of the traversal of the restriction requirement, rejoinder has been considered but is not appropriate because the sealant composition in claim 15 is of a different scope than any other composition under consideration. Moreover, independent claim 18 does not refer to any glass composition.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1 12, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1755

Claims 14, 19 and 20 recite that the composition contains 15-40, or 20-35 weight percent Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>. The only reference that the examiner was able to locate with regards to amount of forsterite is at page 15, lines 29-30 which discloses a composition containing 51.25 wt% Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>. This is inadequate support for the recitations 15-40 or 20-35 wt% Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub>.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrissey (US Patent No. 3,022,179).

Morrissey et al. discloses a glass composition that the examiner believes has overlapping ranges of components with the glass of the present invention. Further in this regard, a theoretical composition containing 50 wt% SiO2, 30 wt% BaO, 15 wt% MgF<sub>2</sub> and 5 wt% MgO (within the scope of Morrissey) converts to a glass containing 56 wt% SiO<sub>2</sub>, 13 mol% BaO, 23 mol% MgF<sub>2</sub> and 8 mol% MgO (a composition within the instant claims). Overlapping ranges have sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

The reference discloses the presence of additional "fluxing agents" whereas the instant claims employ "consisting essentially of" language. However, there is nothing of record to suggest that MgF<sub>2</sub> would materially affect the novel or basic characteristics of the present composition.

The reference fails to disclose that the composition is "for a high operating temperature sealed assembly in ceramic electrolyte electrochemical conversion devices." However, this recitation is a statement of intended use, and must imply a structure that results in a product that

Art Unit: 1755

is different than the prior art. See MPEP 2111.02. No difference is seen between the structure of the prior art and the present claims.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of claims 14, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Applicants assert that point 5 on Figure 1B is adequate written support the claimed amount of forsterite. It is not seen how point 5 relates to the amount of Mg<sub>2</sub>SiO<sub>4</sub> in the composition. Point 5 represents the weight ratio of MgO and SiO<sub>2</sub> in forsterite, not the amount of forsterite in the sealant composition.

Rejection of the claims as obvious over Morrissey (US Patent No. 3,022,179)

Applicants assert that the use of "consisting essentially of" claim language precludes the addition of Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. This argument is deemed persuasive, however, there is nothing that suggests that MgF<sub>2</sub> would materially affect the basic or novel characteristics of the invention.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4 and 6 allowed. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1755

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Sample whose telephone number is (571)272-1376. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on (572)272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1755

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Sample

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755